

Remarks

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action mailed May 10, 2005. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application and respectfully request favorable action in this case.

Claim Rejections — 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected Claims 11-12, 14-18, 20-21, 24-26, 37-38, 40-44, 53-54, 56-60, 62-65, and 67-71 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the original disclosure fails to teach each position corresponding to a particular receiver "independent of the value for that position" as recited in Claims 11, 26, 37, and 67-71.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the original specification includes a description that reasonably conveys to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s) had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. In particular, Applicants direct the Examiner to Page 17, lines 4-24. That portion of the specification states:

In one embodiment, since each bit position 82 within destination code 80 corresponds to a particular card slot within switching unit 10, and therefore to a particular switching unit controller 12 or service provider 14 associated with the particular card slot, destination code 80 should include at least as many bit positions as there may be active cards during operation of switching unit 10.

(p. 17, ll. 11-16). Thus, the specification describes that each bit position corresponds to a particular receiver (or card slot), and that the correspondence is independent of the value for that position. Indeed, as described in the specification, the value for a bit position does not identify the corresponding receiver (or slave), but rather the value indicates whether the receiver corresponding with the bit position should receive the message packet:

In one embodiment, a "1" value for a particular bit position 82 indicates that the slave associated with the bit position 82 will receive message packet 50, while a "0" value for a particular bit position 82 indicates that the slave may ignore message packet 50. Of course, "1" and "0" bit values may provide an opposite indication without departing from the intended scope of the present invention.

(p. 17, ll. 16-20). Thus, each position corresponds to a particular receiver independent of the value for that position.

Rejections — 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has withdrawn his prior art rejection of Claims 11, 12, 17, 18, 37, 38, 43, 44, 53, 54, 59, 60, and 65. (Office Action at p. 8).

The Examiner rejected Claims 16, 42, 58, 64, 67, 68, 70 and 71 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,351,294 (*Matsumoto*).

Independent Claim 67 and Dependent Claims 16

Independent Claim 67 recites:

A telecommunications device, comprising:
a local area network;
a plurality of receivers coupled to the network; and
a sender coupled to the network and operable to generate a message packet comprising a destination code and a data packet, the destination code having values for a plurality of positions, each position corresponding to a particular receiver independent of the value for that position, the sender operable to identify one or more receivers for the data packet according to the values of the positions corresponding to the receivers, the sender operable to communicate the data packet to the identified receivers.

Matsumoto does not disclose, teach, or suggest the telecommunications device of Claim 67. *Matsumoto* describes a method for broadcasting information between separate devices—in particular, from information service unit 104 to user terminals 107, 110, 116, 120, and 124. (Col. 5, l. 45 - col. 6, l. 14). Thus, the format of data transmission described with reference to Figure 6 of *Matsumoto* does not relate to communication between a sender and receivers all within a telecommunications device as recited in Claim 67. For at least this reason, *Matsumoto* does not disclose, teach, or suggest the telecommunications device of Claim 67. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 67, as well as all claims that depend from Claim 67.

Independent Claim 68 and Dependent Claims 42

Independent Claim 68 recites:

A method of communicating a data packet using a local area network within a telecommunications device, comprising:

generating a message packet comprising a destination code and the data packet, the destination code having values for a plurality of positions, each of the positions corresponding to a particular receiver independent of the value for that position;
identifying one or more receivers for the data packet according to the values of the positions corresponding to the receivers; and
communicating the data packet to the identified receivers using the network.

Matsumoto does not disclose, teach, or suggest a “method of communicating a data packet using a local area network within a telecommunications device,” as recited in Claim 68. As described above with reference to Claim 67, *Matsumoto* describes a method for broadcasting information between separate devices—in particular, from information service unit 104 to user terminals 107, 110, 116, 120, and 124. (Col. 5, l. 45 - col. 6, l. 14). Thus, the format of data transmission described with reference to Figure 6 of *Matsumoto* does not relate to communication within a telecommunications device, as recited in Claim 68. For at least this reason, *Matsumoto* does not disclose, teach, or suggest the method of Claim 68. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 68, as well as all claims that depend from Claim 68.

Independent Claim 70 and Dependent Claims 58

Independent Claim 70 recites:

Logic for communicating a data packet using a local area network within a telecommunications device, the logic encoded in media and operable to:
generate a message packet comprising a destination code and the data packet, the destination code having values for a plurality of positions, each of the positions corresponding to a particular receiver independent of the value for that position;
identify one or more receivers for the data packet according to the values of the positions corresponding to the receivers; and
communicate the data packet to the identified receivers using the network.

Matsumoto does not disclose, teach, or suggest logic “for communicating a data packet using a local area network within a telecommunications device,” as recited in Claim 70. As described above with reference to Claim 67, *Matsumoto* describes a method for broadcasting information between separate devices—in particular, from information service unit 104 to

user terminals 107, 110, 116, 120, and 124. (Col. 5, l. 45 - col. 6, l. 14). Thus, the format of data transmission described with reference to Figure 6 of *Matsumoto* does not relate to communication within a telecommunications device, as recited in Claim 70. For at least this reason, *Matsumoto* does not disclose, teach, or suggest the logic of Claim 70. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 70, as well as all claims that depend from Claim 70.

Independent Claim 71 and Dependent Claims 64

Independent Claim 71 recites:

A message packet for communication using a local area network within a telecommunications device, comprising:
a data packet; and
a destination code, the destination code having values for a plurality of positions, each position corresponding to a particular receiver independent of the value for that position, the values of the positions corresponding to the receivers operable to identify one or more receivers for the data packet, the data packet operable to be communicated to the identified receivers.

Matsumoto does not disclose, teach, or suggest a “message packet for communication using a local area network within a telecommunications device,” as recited in Claim 71. As described above with reference to Claim 67, *Matsumoto* describes a method for broadcasting information between separate devices—in particular, from information service unit 104 to user terminals 107, 110, 116, 120, and 124. (Col. 5, l. 45 - col. 6, l. 14). Thus, the format of data transmission described with reference to Figure 6 of *Matsumoto* does not relate to communication within a telecommunications device, as recited in Claim 71. For at least this reason, *Matsumoto* does not disclose, teach, or suggest the message packet of Claim 71. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 71, as well as all claims that depend from Claim 71.

Claim Rejections — 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected Claims 24, 26, and 69 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4, 593,282 (*Acampora*) in view of *Matsumoto*.

Independent Claim 26 and Dependent Claims 24

Independent Claim 26 recites:

A message packet for communication using a local area network within a telecommunications device, comprising:

a data packet;

an arbitration code comprising a message priority code and a sender address, a first value of the arbitration code operable to be communicated using the network and to be compared with a network value to determine whether the sender may communicate the data packet to the receiver using the network; and

a destination code having values for a plurality of positions, each position corresponding to a particular receiver independent of the value for that position, the values of the positions identifying one or more receivers for the data packet, the value for at least one position of the destination code operable to be compared with a value for at least one position of a receive code associated with a receiver to determine whether the receiver will receive the data packet.

Matsumoto does not disclose, teach, or suggest a “message packet for communication using a local area network within a telecommunications device,” as recited in Claim 26. As described above with reference to Claim 67, *Matsumoto* describes a method for broadcasting information between separate devices—in particular, from information service unit 104 to user terminals 107, 110, 116, 120, and 124. (Col. 5, l. 45 - col. 6, l. 14). Thus, the format of data transmission described with reference to Figure 6 of *Matsumoto* does not relate to communication within a telecommunications device, as recited in Claim 11.

Furthermore, *Matsumoto* does not disclose, teach, or suggest “a destination code having values for a plurality of positions, each position corresponding to a particular receiver independent of the value for that position, the values of the positions identifying one or more receivers for the data packet, the value for at least one position of the destination code operable to be compared with a value for at least one position of a receive code associated with a receiver to determine whether the receiver will receive the data packet,” as recited in Claim 26. In particular, the Examiner does not cite any portion of *Matsumoto* which discloses the recited receive code. As expressly recited in Claim 26, the receive code is different from the destination code. The Examiner improperly attempts to rely of the destination information 604 of *Matsumoto* to show both the destination code and receive code in the recited limitation. *Matsumoto* does not disclose comparing the values of two different codes—the receive code

(including values for a plurality of positions) and the destination code—to determine whether to receive a data packet.

Moreover, the Examiner does not provide any motivation to combine the cited references.

For at least these reasons, the Examiner's cited combination does not disclose, teach, or suggest the message packet of Claim 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 26, as well as all claims that depend from Claim 26.

Independent Claim 69

Independent Claim 69 recites:

Logic for communicating a data packet using a local area network within a telecommunications device, the logic encoded in media and operable to:

generate a message packet comprising an arbitration code, the data packet, and a destination code having values for a plurality of positions, each position corresponding to a particular receiver independent of the value for that position;

identify one or more receivers for the message packet according to the values of the positions corresponding to the receivers;

communicate a first value of the arbitration code using the network;

determine a network value;

compare the first value with the network value; and

determine whether to communicate the data packet using the network.

Matsumoto does not disclose, teach, or suggest “[l]ogic for communicating a data packet using a local area network within a telecommunications device,” as recited in Claim 69. As described above with reference to Claim 67, *Matsumoto* describes a method for broadcasting information between separate devices—in particular, from information service unit 104 to user terminals 107, 110, 116, 120, and 124. (Col. 5, l. 45 - col. 6, l. 14). Thus, the format of data transmission described with reference to Figure 6 of *Matsumoto* does not relate to communication within a telecommunications device, as recited in Claim 71. Moreover, the Examiner does not provide any motivation to combine the cited references. For at least these reasons, the Examiner's cited combination does not disclose, teach, or suggest the logic of

Claim 69. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 69, as well as all claims that depend from Claim 69.

Dependent Claims 14, 20, 40, 56, 62

The Examiner rejected dependent Claims 14, 20, 40, 56, and 62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Acampora* and *Matsumoto* in view of *Ganesh*.

The cited combination does not disclose, teach, or suggest “the device is a switching unit further comprising a backplane and the network comprises a control bus,” as recited in Claims 14, 20, 40, 56, and 62. As described above, *Matsumoto* does not disclose a method of communicating a data packet “within a telecommunication device.” These dependent claims further specify “the device is a switching unit further comprising a backplane and the network comprises a control bus.” The Examiner does not provide any motivation to apply the method for broadcasting information between separate devices (as described in *Matsumoto*) to a switching unit as recited in these dependent claims. For this additional reason, dependent Claims 14, 20, 40, 56, and 62 are allowable over the Examiner’s cited combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of dependent Claims 14, 20, 40, 56, and 62.

Dependent Claim 15, 21, 41, 57, 63

Dependent Claim 15, 21, 41, 57 and 63 depend from independent Claims 67, 26, 68, 70, and 71, respectively, and they are allowable because, at a minimum, they include the limitations of their respective base claims.

Conclusion

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Jeffery D. Baxter, Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6791.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Jeffery D. Baxter
Reg. No. 45,560

Date: July 8, 2009

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number

05073